arXiv:0811.3960v2 [math-ph] 8 Oct 2009

THE LIOUVILLE EQUATION FOR SINGULAR ERGODIC MAGNETIC SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS

YANG KANG AND ABEL KLEIN

Abstract. We study the time evolution of a density matrix in a quantum mechanical system described by an ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator with singular magnetic and electric potentials, the electric field being introduced adiabatically. We construct a unitary propagator that solves weakly the corresponding time-dependent Schrödinger equation, and solve a Liouville equation in an appropriate Hilbert space.

1. Introduction

We study non-interacting quantum particles in a disordered background described by a one-particle ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator. The system is taken to be at equilibrium at time $t = -\infty$ in a state given by a one-particle density matrix, and the electric field is introduced adiabatically. The time evolution of the density matrix is then described by a Liouville equation. In this article we consider singular ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operators, the conditions on the magnetic and electric potentials only ensure that $C_{\mathrm{c}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a form core for the magnetic Schrödinger operator, and prove that the Liouville equation can be given a precise meaning and solved in an appropriate Hilbert space. A similar result was previously obtained by Bouclet, Germinet, Klein and Schenker [BGKS] under stronger conditions on the magnetic and electric potentials that yield essential self-adjointness of the magnetic Schrödinger operator on $C_{\mathrm{c}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We consider magnetic Schrödinger operators of the form

$$H = H(\mathbf{A}, V) := (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A})^2 + V \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{H} := \mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{1.1}$$

where the magnetic potential $\mathbf{A}$ and the electric potential V satisfy:

- (i) $\mathbf{A} \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$,
- (ii) $V = V_+ - V_-$, where $V_\pm \in \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $V_\pm \geq 0$, and V_- is relatively form bounded with respect to Δ with relative bound < 1, i.e., there are $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $\beta \geq 0$ such that

$$\langle \psi, V_- \psi \rangle \leq \alpha \langle \psi, -\Delta \psi \rangle + \beta ||\psi||^2. \tag{1.2}$$

H is naturally defined as a semi-bounded self-adjoint operator by a quadratic form, with $C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ being a form core, and the diamagnetic inequality holds for H (cf. [S2, Theorems 2.2 and 2.3]; although $V_- = 0$ in [S2], the results extends to V_- relatively bounded as in (1.2) by an approximation argument as in [F, Proposition 7.7 and Theorem 7.9].). The usual trace estimates for Schrödinger operators hold for H (cf. [BGKS, Proposition 2.1]).

A.K was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-0457474.

In a disordered background the system is modeled by an ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator

$$H_\omega = H(\mathbf{A}_\omega, V_\omega) := (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A}_\omega)^2 + V_\omega \quad \text{on} \quad \mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{1.3}$$

where the parameter ω runs in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, and for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω we assign a magnetic potential A_ω and an electric potential V_ω such that $H_\omega = H(\mathbf{A}_\omega, V_\omega)$ is as in (1.1). The ergodic system satisfies a covariance relation: there exist an ergodic group $\{\tau(a);\ a \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ of measure preserving transformations on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ and a unitary projective representation $U(a)$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ on $\mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω

$$U(a)H_\omega(t)U(a)^* = H_{\tau(a)\omega}(t) \ \text{ and } \ U(a)\chi_b U(a)^* = \chi_{b+a} \ \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{1.4}$$

where χ_a denotes multiplication by the characteristic function of the unit cube centered at a. It follows from ergodicity that $(V_\omega)_-$ satisfies (1.2) $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. with the same constants α and β, and there exists a constant γ such that

$$H_\omega + \gamma \geq 1. \tag{1.5}$$

At time $t = -\infty$, the system is in equilibrium in the state given by a one-particle density matrix $\zeta_\omega = f(H_\omega)$, where f is a non-negative bounded function with fast enough decay at infinity. At zero temperature we take $\zeta_\omega = P_\omega^{(E_F)} = \chi_{(-\infty, E_F]}(H_\omega)$, the Fermi projection corresponding to the Fermi energy E_F. A homogeneous electric field $\mathbf{E}$ is then slowly switched on from time $t = -\infty$ to time $t = 0$. We take $\eta > 0$, let $t_- = \min\{t, 0\}$, $t_+ = \max\{t, 0\}$, and set

$$\mathbf{E}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{\eta t_-}\mathbf{E}\,. \tag{1.6}$$

The dynamics are now generated, in the appropriate gauge (see [BGKS, Section 2.2]), by the ergodic time-dependent magnetic Schrödinger operator

$$H_\omega(t) = (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A}_\omega - \mathbf{F}(t))^2 + V_\omega = G(t)H_\omega G(t)^*\,, \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbf{E}(s)\mathrm{d}s = \left(\tfrac{\mathrm{e}^{\eta t_-}}{\eta} + t_+\right)\mathbf{E}\,, \tag{1.8}$$

and $G(t) = \mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{F}(t)\cdot x}$ is a gauge transformation on $\mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that $H_\omega(t)$ is almost surely a magnetic Schrödinger operator as in (1.1). Under this time evolution, $\varrho_\omega(t)$, the density matrix at time t, is the solution of the Liouville equation given formally by

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \varrho_\omega(t) = [H_\omega(t), \varrho_\omega(t)] \\ \lim_{t\to-\infty} \varrho_\omega(t) = \zeta_\omega \end{cases}. \tag{1.9}$$

We will give a precise meaning to this Liouville equation for an ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator H_ω as in (1.3), and construct its solution. We will assume

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|x_k^2\,\zeta_\omega\chi_0\right\|_2^2\right\} < \infty \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \cdots, d, \tag{1.10}$$

where $\|S\|_2$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the operator S. (If $\zeta_\omega = P_\omega^{(E_F)}$ where E_F falls inside a gap of the spectrum of H_ω, or $\zeta_\omega = f(H_\omega)$ with f smooth and appropriately decaying at high energies, then (1.10) is readily fulfilled by general arguments, cf. [GK1]. It also holds for $\zeta_\omega = P_\omega^{(E_F)}$ if the Fermi energy E_F is inside a region of complete localization by [GK2].)

The Liouville equation (1.9) was studied by Bouclet, Germinet, Klein, and Schenker [BGKS] under the stronger assumption that the magnetic and electric potentials satisfy the Leinfelder-Simader conditions [LS]:

(a) $\mathbf{A} \in \mathrm{L}^4_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
(b) $V = V_+ - V_-$ with $V_\pm \in \mathrm{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $V_\pm \geq 0$, and V_- relatively bounded with respect to Δ with relative bound < 1.

Under these conditions $H(\mathbf{A}, V)$ is essentially self-adjoint on $C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ [LS, Theorem 3]. Letting

$$H(t) = H(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{F}(t), V) = (-i\nabla - \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{F}(t))^2 + V, \tag{1.11}$$

where $\mathbf{F}(t)$ is as in (1.8), these time-dependent operators have the same domain: $\mathcal{D}(H(t)) = \mathcal{D}(H)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, with $\mathcal{D}(A)$ the domain of the operator A. Bouclet, Germinet, Klein, and Schenker then used a well-known theorem due to Yosida [Y, Theorem XIV.4.1] to solve the corresponding time-dependent Schrödinger equation by means of a unitary propagator, which plays a major role in their analysis of the Liouville equation.

The common domain condition does not hold for the time-dependent operators $H(t)$ in (1.11) under the more general conditions given in (1.1). But, as we shall see, we have a common quadratic form domain: $Q(H(t)) = Q(H)$ for all t, where $Q(A)$ denotes the quadratic form domain of the self-adjoint operator A. In view of (1.5), we may take $H(t) \geq 1$ without loss of generality. It then follows from the closed graph theorem that

$$\Gamma(t,s) := H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - I = H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - H(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \tag{1.12}$$

is a family of bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$ for all t and s.

We will prove an extension of Yosida's Theorem if the operators $\Gamma(t,s)$ meet certain conditions. Before stating our theorem, recall that a two-parameter family of unitary operators $U(t,s)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, $s,t \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is called a unitary propagator if it satisfies

1) $U(t,r)U(r,s) = U(t,s)$, (1.13)
2) $U(t,t) = I$, (1.14)
3) $U(t,s)$ is jointly strongly continuous in t and s. (1.15)

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval and $\mathcal{H}$ a Hilbert space. Suppose that for each $t \in \mathcal{I}_0$ we are given a self adjoint operator $H(t) \geq 1$ on $\mathcal{H}$ such that its form domain $Q(H(t))$ is independent of t: there exists a dense subspace Q of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $Q(H(t)) = Q$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}_0$. Suppose that for some closed subinterval $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}_0$ the following holds for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$:*

a) *$\frac{1}{t-s}\Gamma(t,s)\varphi$ is uniformly bounded and strongly continuous for all t, s $(t \neq s)$ in $\mathcal{I}$.*
b) *The limits*

$$\Gamma_1(u)\varphi := \lim_{t\uparrow u} \tfrac{1}{u-t}\Gamma(t,u)\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2(u)\varphi := \lim_{s\uparrow u} \tfrac{1}{u-s}\Gamma(u,s)\varphi \tag{1.16}$$

exist uniformly in $u \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\Gamma_1(u) + \Gamma_2(u) = 0$.

Then there exists a unique unitary propagator $U(t,s)$, $t,s\in\mathcal{I}$, *such that*

$$U(t,s)Q = Q\ , \tag{1.17}$$

$$i\partial_t\langle\varphi,U(t,s)\psi\rangle = \langle H(t)^{\frac12}\,\varphi, H(t)^{\frac12}U(t,s)\psi\rangle \quad \textit{for all } \varphi,\psi\in Q\,, \tag{1.18}$$

$$i\partial_s\langle\varphi,U(t,s)\psi\rangle = -\,\langle H(s)^{\frac12}\,U(t,s)^*\varphi, H(s)^{\frac12}\,\psi\rangle \quad \textit{for all } \varphi,\psi\in Q\,. \tag{1.19}$$

Related results for a time-dependent Hamiltonian with a time-independent form domain can be found in [K, Theorem 8.1] and [S1, Theorems II.23, II.27].

Theorem 1.1 is exactly what we need in view of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $H(t)$ *be given in* (1.11) *with* $\mathbf{A}$ *and* V *as in* (1.1)*, adjusted so* $H(t)\geq 1$*. Then the form domains* $Q(H(t))$ *are independent of* t*:*

$$Q(H(t)) = Q := Q(H) \quad \textit{for all } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.20}$$

Moreover, $\Gamma(t,s)$*, defined in (1.12), satisfies hypotheses a) and b) of Theorem 1.1.*

To give a precise meaning to the Liouville equation (1.9) we need to introduce normed spaces of measurable covariant operators, which we briefly describe here. We refer the reader to [BGKS, Section 3] for background, details, and justifications. We assume the setting of (1.3)-(1.4); given $\mathcal{H}=\mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{c}}$ denote the subspace of functions with compact support. We set $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{c}},\mathcal{H})$ to be the vector space of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with domain $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{c}}$, and let $\mathcal{K}_{mc}$ be the vector space of measurable covariant maps $A\colon\Omega\to\mathcal{L}$, $\omega\mapsto A_\omega$. Throughout the article, we simplify the notation and write $A=A_\omega$. We also identify maps that agree $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. The map A_ω is measurable if the functions $\omega\to\langle\varphi,A_\omega\varphi\rangle$ are measurable for all $\varphi\in\mathcal{H}_c$, and A_ω is covariant if it satisfies (1.4). A_ω is locally bounded if $\|A_\omega\chi_x\|<\infty$ and $\|\chi_xA_\omega\|<\infty$ for all $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, and we denote by $\mathcal{K}_{mc,lb}$ the subspace of locally bounded operators. If $A_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_{mc,lb}$, then $\mathcal{D}(A_\omega^*)\supset\mathcal{H}_c$, and we set $A_\omega{}^\ddagger := A_\omega{}^*\big|_{\mathcal{H}_c}$.

We introduce norms on $\mathcal{K}_{mc,lb}$, given by

$$|\!|\!|A_\omega|\!|\!|_i^i := \mathbb{E}\big\{\mathrm{tr}\{\chi_0|\overline{A_\omega}|^i\chi_0\}\big\} \quad \text{for } i=1,2\ , \quad |\!|\!|A_\omega|\!|\!|_\infty := \|\,\|A_\omega\|\,\|_{\mathrm{L}^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{P})}, \tag{1.21}$$

and define the normed spaces

$$\mathcal{K}_i := \{A_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_{mc,lb};\ |\!|\!|A_\omega|\!|\!|_i<\infty\}, \qquad i=1,2,\infty. \tag{1.22}$$

$\mathcal{K}_\infty$ is a Banach space, $\mathcal{K}_1$ a normed space with closure $\overline{\mathcal{K}_1}$, and $\mathcal{K}_2$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product

$$\langle\langle A_\omega,B_\omega\rangle\rangle := \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathrm{tr}\{(A_\omega\chi_0)^*B_\omega\chi_0\}\right\}. \tag{1.23}$$

We consider the following linear functional on the space $\mathcal{K}_1$: for $A_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_1$,

$$\mathcal{T}(A_\omega) := \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathrm{tr}\,\chi_0A_\omega\chi_0\right\}. \tag{1.24}$$

Since $|\mathcal{T}(A_\omega)|<|\!|\!|A_\omega|\!|\!|_1$, $\mathcal{T}$ is well-defined on $\mathcal{K}_1$. In addition, $\mathcal{T}$ is the trace per unit volume due to the Birkhoff ergodic theorem [BGKS, Proposition 3.20].

The spaces $\mathcal{K}_i$, $i=1,2$, are left and right $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-modules. We define left and right multiplication for $B_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_\infty$ and $A_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_1$ or $\mathcal{K}_2$ by

$$B_\omega\odot_L A_\omega = B_\omega A_\omega\ , \quad A_\omega\odot_R B_\omega = \left(B_\omega^*\odot_L A_\omega{}^\ddagger\right)^\ddagger = A_\omega{}^{\ddagger*}B_\omega\ , \tag{1.25}$$

and set

$$\mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega) := U_\omega(t,s)\odot_L A_\omega\odot_R U_\omega(s,t) \quad \text{for } A_\omega\in\mathcal{K}_i. \tag{1.26}$$

$\mathcal{U}(t,s)$ leaves $\mathcal{K}_i$ invariant for $i = 1, 2, \infty$ (See Proposition 4.1).

We will show that the Liouville equation (1.9) can be solved in a weak sense in the space $\mathcal{K}_2$. We let $Q^{(0)}$ denote the subspace of $\mathcal{K}_2$ given by

$$Q^{(0)} = \left\{ A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 \,|\, H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^\ddagger \in \mathcal{K}_2 \right\} = \left\{ A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 \,|\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^\ddagger \in \mathcal{K}_2 \right\} \tag{1.27}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. (We refer the reader to Section 4.1 – especially Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 – for the argument that $Q^{(0)}$ does not depend on t.) The quadratic forms $\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_L$, $\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_R$, and $\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}$ are defined on $Q^{(0)}$ as follows:

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_{L,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \langle\langle H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \rangle\rangle \ , \tag{1.28}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_{R,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \langle\langle H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega^\ddagger, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^\ddagger \rangle\rangle \ , \text{ and} \tag{1.29}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t = \widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_{L,t} - \widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_{R,t} \ . \tag{1.30}$$

Recall that $\zeta_\omega = f(H_\omega)$ with f real and bounded. We assumed (1.10), which implies $[x_k, \zeta_\omega] \in \mathcal{K}_2$ for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, the condition used in [BGKS]. We set

$$\zeta_\omega(t) = f(H_\omega(t)). \tag{1.31}$$

Theorem 1.3. *Let H_ω be the ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator in* (1.3)-(1.4), *adjusted so $H_\omega \geq 1$, and let $H_\omega(t)$ be as in* (1.11). *Let ζ_ω be as above satisfying* (1.10). *Then,*

$$\varrho_\omega(t) := \lim_{s \to -\infty} \mathcal{U}(t,s)\,(\zeta_\omega) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} \mathcal{U}(t,s)\,(\zeta_\omega(s)) \tag{1.32}$$

$$= \zeta_\omega(t) - i \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r \, \mathrm{e}^{\eta r_-} \, \mathcal{U}(t,r)\,([\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) \tag{1.33}$$

is well defined in $\mathcal{K}_2$. Moreover, $\rho_\omega(t) \in Q^{(0)}$, and it is the unique solution of the Liouville equation in the following sense: for all $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$ we have

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t) \rangle\rangle = \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t(A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)) \\ \lim_{t \to -\infty} \langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t) \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, \zeta_\omega \rangle\rangle \end{cases} . \tag{1.34}$$

We will actually prove a stronger version of Theorem 1.3 (cf. Theorem 5.1).

2. The extension of Yosida's Theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. We assume throughout the section that $H(t)$ and $\Gamma(t,s)$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1.

We define unitary operators $U_k(t,s)$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, and $s, t \in \mathcal{I}$, a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$U_k(t,s) = \mathrm{e}^{-i(t-s)H(m + \frac{j-1}{k})} \quad \text{for } m + \tfrac{j-1}{k} \leq s \leq t \leq m + \tfrac{j}{k}, \quad t, s \in \mathcal{I}, m \in \mathbb{Z}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, k, \tag{2.1}$$

$$U_k(t,r) = U_k(t,s) U_k(s,r) \qquad \text{for } s \leq r \leq t \in \mathcal{I}\,, \tag{2.2}$$

$$U_k(t,s) = U_k(s,t)^* \qquad \text{for all } s, t \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.1. *For all $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ and all $s, t \in \mathcal{I}$,*

$$W_k(t,s) := H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(t,s) H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.4}$$

is well defined as a bounded operator. In fact,

$$\|W_k(t,s)\| \leq \left(1+\tfrac{M_I}{k}\right)^2 e^{M_I|t-s|}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$M_I := \sup_{t,s\in\mathcal{I},t\neq s} |t-s|^{-1} \|\,\Gamma(t,s)\| \,. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Proceeding as in [Y, Theorem XIV.4.1], we can write $W_k(t,s)$, using (2.1)-(2.3), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W_k(t,s) = \left(\Gamma\left(t,\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)+I\right)&\left\{U_k\,(t,s)+{W_k}^{(1)}(t,s)+{W_k}^{(2)}(t,s)+\cdots\right\} \\ &\times\left(\Gamma\left(\tfrac{[ks]}{k},s\right)+I\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where for $s \leq t$

$${W_k}^{(1)}(t,s) = \sum_{ku=[ks]+1}^{[kt]} U_k(t,u)\Gamma\left(u,u-\tfrac{1}{k}\right)U_k(u,s), \tag{2.8}$$

$${W_k}^{(m+1)}(t,s) = \sum_{ku=[ks]+m+1}^{[kt]} U_k(t,u)\Gamma\left(u,u-\tfrac{1}{k}\right){W_k}^{(m)}(u,s), \tag{2.9}$$

and for $s \geq t$

$${W_k}^{(1)}(t,s) = \sum_{ku=[kt]+1}^{[ks]} U_k(t,u)\Gamma\left(u-\tfrac{1}{k},u\right)U_k(u,s), \tag{2.10}$$

$${W_k}^{(m+1)}(t,s) = \sum_{ku=[kt]+1}^{[ks]-m} U_k(t,u)\Gamma\left(u-\tfrac{1}{k},u\right){W_k}^{(m)}(u,s). \tag{2.11}$$

In both cases, we see that $W_k^{(m)}$ is bounded for each k with the following bound:

$$\|{W_k}^{(m)}(t,s)\varphi\| \leq \tfrac{(t-s)^m}{m!}M_I^m\|\varphi\|, \quad m=1,2,\ldots, \tag{2.12}$$

so (2.5) follows from (2.7) and (2.12). □

Lemma 2.2. *The unitary operators $U_k(t,s)$, $t,s\in\mathcal{I}$, converge strongly as $k\to\infty$ to a unitary propagator $U(t,s)$. That is,*

$$U(t,s)\psi = \lim_{k\to\infty} U_k(t,s)\psi \quad \textit{for } \ t,s\in\mathcal{I} \tag{2.13}$$

defines a unitary propagator, the convergence being uniform on $\psi\in\mathcal{H}$. In addition, for $j=1,2,\cdots$,

$${W_k}^{(j)}(t,s) \to W^{(j)}(t,s) \quad \textit{strongly for } t,s\in\mathcal{I}, \tag{2.14}$$

where $W^{(j)}(t,s)$ are bounded operators given by

$$W^{(1)}(t,s) = \int_s^t du\,U(t,u)\Gamma_2(u)U(u,s), \tag{2.15}$$

$$W^{(j+1)}(t,s) = \int_s^t du\,U(t,u)\Gamma_2(u)W^{(j)}(u,s). \tag{2.16}$$

Furthermore, for all $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$*, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} W(t,s) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} W_k(t,s) = U(t,s) + W^{(1)}(t,s) + W^{(2)}(t,s) + \cdots && (2.17)\\ &= H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t,s) H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, && (2.18)\end{aligned}$$

the limits being in the strong operator topology, is a bounded operator, weakly continuous in t *on* $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q$ *for* $s \leq t$ *and weakly continuous in* s *on* $H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q$ *for* $s \geq t$*.*

Proof. We will prove the lemma for $s \leq t$, the case $s \geq t$ being similar. We first prove (2.13). By construction (cf. (2.1)-(2.2)), we have $U_k(t,s)Q \subset Q$. Since

$$U_k(t,s) = U_k\left(t, \tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right) U_k\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}, s\right) = \exp\left(-i\left(t - \tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right) H\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)\right) U_k\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}, s\right), \tag{2.19}$$

it follows that $U_k(t,s)$ is jointly strongly continuous in $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$, and $U_k(t,s)$ is weakly differentiable in t ($t \neq \frac{j}{k}$) on Q in the following sense: for $\varphi, \psi \in Q$,

$$i\partial_t \langle \varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle = \left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi\, , H\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(t,s)\psi \right\rangle. \tag{2.20}$$

Fixing $s_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ and writing $\varphi = H(s_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\varphi}$, $\psi = H(s_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\psi}$, with $\widetilde{\varphi}, \widetilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t \langle \varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle &= \left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} H(s_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\varphi}\, , H\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(t,s) H(s_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\psi} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left(\Gamma\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}, s_0\right) + I\right)\widetilde{\varphi}, \left(\Gamma\left(\tfrac{[kt]}{k}, t\right) + I\right) W_k(t,s) \left(\Gamma(s, s_0) + I\right)\widetilde{\psi} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Hence, by hypothesis $a)$ of Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 2.1, $i\partial_t\langle \varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle$ is bounded and is (piece-wise) continuous in t for $t \neq \frac{j}{k}$. Moreover, the same argument repeated for the other variable (i.e., for s) gives, with $\varphi, \psi \in Q$,

$$i\partial_s \langle \varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle = -\left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[ks]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(t,s)^*\varphi\, , H\left(\tfrac{[ks]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi \right\rangle, \tag{2.22}$$

and that $i\partial_s\langle \varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle$ is bounded and continuous in s for $s \neq \frac{j}{k}$.

Thus, one may easily compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, \left(U_k(t,s) - U_n(t,s)\right)\psi\rangle &= \int_s^t \tfrac{d}{dr}\left\langle \varphi\, , U_n(t,r) U_k(r,s) H(s_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\psi}\right\rangle dr \qquad (2.23)\\ = i\int_s^t &\left\langle \Gamma\left(\tfrac{[kr]}{k}, \tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right) H\left(\tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_n(t,r)^*\varphi\, , \widetilde{\Gamma}\left(\tfrac{[kr]}{k}, r\right) W_k(r,s)\widetilde{\Gamma}\left(s, s_0\right)\widetilde{\psi}\right\rangle dr \\ - i\int_s^t &\left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_n(t,r)^*\varphi\, , \Gamma\left(\tfrac{[kr]}{k}, \tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right)\widetilde{\Gamma}\left(\tfrac{[nr]}{n}, r\right) W_k(r,s)\widetilde{\Gamma}\left(s, s_0\right)\widetilde{\psi}\right\rangle dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma + I$. By (2.6), we have

$$\left\|\Gamma\left(\tfrac{[kr]}{k}, \tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right)\right\| \leq \left|\tfrac{[kr]}{k} - \tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right| M_I, \tag{2.24}$$

and by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|H\left(\tfrac{[nr]}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_n(t,r)^*\varphi\right\| &= \left\|\left(\Gamma\left(\tfrac{[nr]}{n}, t\right) + I\right) W_n(r,t)\left(\Gamma(r, s_0) + I\right)\widetilde{\varphi}\right\| \\ &\leq \left(M_I\left|\tfrac{[nr]}{n} - t\right| + I\right)\left(1 + \tfrac{M_I}{n}\right)^2 e^{M_I(t-r)}\left(M_I|r - s_0| + I\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Since $\Gamma\left(\frac{[kr]}{k}, r\right), \Gamma(s, s_0)$, and $W_k(r,s)$ are all uniformly bounded independent of r, s, and k, and since

$$\|(U_k(t,s) - U_n(t,s))\,\psi\| = \sup_{\varphi\in Q, \|\varphi\|=1} |\langle \varphi, (U_k(t,s) - U_n(t,s))\,\psi\rangle|, \tag{2.26}$$

we see that $U_k(t,s)\psi$ converges uniformly on Q for $s \le t$, $s, t \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $U_k(t,s)$ is uniformly bounded, the limit in (2.13) exists uniformly on $\mathcal{H}$ for $s \le t$. It is a simple exercise to show that (2.20) and (2.22) also hold for the case $s \ge t$. Thus, (2.13) holds for all $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$, and we conclude that $U(t,s)$, $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$, is a unitary propagator.

We can prove (2.14) for $s \le t$ as follows. Recalling (2.8), one can easily see that, given $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ and letting $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &|W_k^{(1)}(t,s)\varphi - \int_s^t du\, U(t,u)\Gamma_2(u)U(u,s)\varphi| \qquad (2.27)\\ &\le \sup_{|u-v|\le \frac{1}{k}} \left\|U_k(t,u)k\,\Gamma\left(u, u-\tfrac{1}{k}\right)U_k(u,s)\varphi - U(t,u)\Gamma_2(u)U(u,s)\varphi\right\| |t-s| \\ &\quad + \sup_{|u-v|\le \frac{1}{k}} \|U(t,u)\Gamma_2(u)U(u,s)\varphi - U(t,v)\Gamma_2(v)U(v,s)\varphi\|\,|t-s| \;\to\; 0, \end{aligned}$$

using (1.15), (2.13), and the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1. (For $s \ge t$, we simply use $\Gamma_1 = -\Gamma_2$.) Hence, using induction and (2.9), one can show (2.14) for all j and for all $s, t \in \mathcal{I}$. (2.17) now follows from (2.7) and (2.12).

It remains to prove that that $W(t,s)$ for $s \le t$ is given as in (2.18) and that it is weakly continuous in t on $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q$. Note that for all $\varphi \in Q$, we have

$$H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}U_k(t,s)\varphi = W_k(t,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi \to W(t,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi \tag{2.28}$$

Since $H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is closed, it follows that $U(t,s)\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = Q$, and for all $\varphi \in Q$,

$$H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t,s)\varphi = W(t,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi. \tag{2.29}$$

Letting $\varphi = H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\varphi}$ in (2.29) with $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}$, (2.18) now follows. By hypothesis $a)$ of Theorem 1.1, we also note that $H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi$ is continuous in $t \in \mathcal{I}$ for each $\varphi \in Q$. To see this, if $t' \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\varphi = H(t')^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi \in Q$, then

$$\left(H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} - H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\varphi = \left(H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} - H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)H(t')^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi = \Gamma(t,t')\psi \to 0 \tag{2.30}$$

as $t \to t'$. Thus, given $\varphi, \psi \in Q$, and setting $\widetilde{\varphi} = H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, (W(t,s) - W(t',s))\,\widetilde{\varphi}\rangle &= \left\langle \psi, (H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t,s) - H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t',s))\varphi\right\rangle \qquad (2.31)\\ &= \left\langle (H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} - H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}})\psi, U(t,s)\varphi\right\rangle + \left\langle H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi, (U(t,s) - U(t',s))\,\varphi\right\rangle \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $t \to t'$ by (2.29)-(2.30) and the fact that $U(t,s)$ is a unitary propagator. □

.

We now present a proof of Theorem 1.1. In the proof, $[k]$ will denote the largest integer less than or equal to k.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $i\partial_t\langle\varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle$ is bounded and (piece-wise) continuous in t for $t \neq \frac{j}{k}$ by (2.21), which holds for all $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$i\left[\langle\varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle - \langle\varphi, U_k(r,s)\psi\rangle\right] = \int_r^t \left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[kl]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, H\left(\tfrac{[kl]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(l,s)\psi\right\rangle dl. \tag{2.32}$$

Since $H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is strongly continuous in l (by (2.30)), it follows from (2.17) and (2.18) that the integrand in (2.32) converges as $k \to \infty$: for $\varphi,\ \psi \in Q$,

$$\left\langle H\left(\tfrac{[kl]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, H\left(\tfrac{[kl]}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_k(l,s)\psi\right\rangle \to \left\langle H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, W(l,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi\right\rangle. \tag{2.33}$$

Taking limits on both sides of (2.32) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k\to\infty} i\left[\langle\varphi, U_k(t,s)\psi\rangle - \langle\varphi, U_k(r,s)\psi\rangle\right] \qquad (2.34)\\ &\quad= \int_r^t \left\langle H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, W(l,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi\right\rangle dl = \int_r^t \left\langle H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(l,s)\psi\right\rangle dl, \end{aligned}$$

first equality being justified by (2.33) and dominated convergence, and the last equality by (2.29). Since $W(l,s)$ is weakly continuous in l on $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}Q$ (by Lemma 2.2) and $H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is strongly continuous in l, the integrals in (2.34) are well-defined. .Thus,

$$i\left[\langle\varphi, U(t,s)\psi\rangle - \langle\varphi, U(r,s)\psi\rangle\right] = \int_r^t dl \left\langle H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, H(l)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(l,s)\psi\right\rangle \tag{2.35}$$

by (2.13) of Lemma 2.2, and, therefore,

$$i\partial_t\langle\varphi, U(t,s)\psi\rangle = \left\langle H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t,s)\psi\right\rangle \text{ for all } \varphi,\psi \in Q. \tag{2.36}$$

A similar proof, using (2.22), yields, for all $t, s \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$i\partial_s\langle\varphi, U(t,s)\psi\rangle = -\left\langle H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}U^*(t,s)\varphi, H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi\right\rangle \text{ for all } \varphi,\psi \in Q. \tag{2.37}$$

We now show the uniqueness of the solution of (1.18)-(1.19). Let $U(t,s)$ and $\widetilde{U}(t,s)$ be two propagators satisfying (1.18)-(1.19). Then, for all $\varphi,\psi \in Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t\langle\varphi, U(s,t)\widetilde{U}(t,s)\psi\rangle \qquad (2.38)\\ &= \left\langle H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t,s)^*\varphi, H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{U}(t,s)\psi\right\rangle - \left\langle H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}U(t,s)^*\varphi, H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{U}(t,s)\psi\right\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $U(s,t)\widetilde{U}(t,s)$ is constant in t, and letting $t = s$, we see that $U(s,t)\widetilde{U}(t,s) = I$, so $U(t,s) = \widetilde{U}(t,s)$. □

3. The time-dependent magnetic Schrödinger operators and the common quadratic form domain

In this section, we let $H(t)$ be given in (1.11) with $\mathbf{A}$ and V as in (1.1), adjusted so $H(t) \geq 1$, and prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In view of (1.2) and (1.11),

$$Q(H(\mathbf{A},V)) = Q(H(\mathbf{A},V_+)), \text{ and} \tag{3.1}$$

$$Q(H(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}(t),V)) = Q(H(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}(t),V_+)). \tag{3.2}$$

Thus, to prove the first part of the theorem, namely (1.20), it suffices to show

$$Q(H(\mathbf{A},V_+)) = Q(H(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}(t),V_+)). \tag{3.3}$$

Let q_A denote the quadratic form associated with the operator A. Given $\varphi,\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{H(t)}(\varphi,\psi) &= \langle(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{F}(t))\varphi,(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{F}(t))\psi\rangle + \langle\varphi,V\psi\rangle \\ &= q_H(\varphi,\psi)+\mathcal{S}_t(\varphi,\psi), \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_t(\varphi,\psi) &= \langle-\mathbf{F}(t)\varphi,(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})\psi\rangle + \langle(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})\varphi,-\mathbf{F}(t)\psi\rangle + \langle\mathbf{F}(t)\varphi,\mathbf{F}(t)\psi\rangle \\ &= -2\operatorname{Re}\langle\varphi,\mathbf{F}(t)\cdot(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})\psi\rangle + |\mathbf{F}(t)|^2\langle\varphi,\psi\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Since $\mathcal{S}_t(\varphi,\psi)$ is a symmetric quadratic form and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_t(\psi,\psi)| &\le 2(\tfrac{1}{\delta}\,\|\psi\|)(\delta\,\|\mathbf{F}(t)\cdot(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})\psi\|) + |\mathbf{F}(t)|^2\|\psi\|^2 \\ &\le \delta^2|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2\,\|(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})\psi\|^2 + (\tfrac{1}{\delta^2}+|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2)\,\|\psi\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have, for suitable δ (e.g., take $\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\mathbf{F}(t)|}$ and set $\alpha := \delta^2|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} < 1$ and $\beta := \frac{1}{\delta^2}+|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2 = 3|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2$),

$$|\mathcal{S}_t(\psi,\psi)| \le \alpha\, q_{H(\mathbf{A},0)}(\psi,\psi) + \beta||\psi||^2 \le \alpha\, q_{H(\mathbf{A},V_+)}(\psi,\psi) + \beta||\psi||^2 \tag{3.7}$$

for all $\psi \in Q(H(\mathbf{A},V_+))$ and $0 \le \alpha < 1$. It follows from [RS2, Theorem X.17] that $Q(H(\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{F}(t),V_+)) = Q(H(\mathbf{A},V_+))$, and this proves (1.20).

To finish, we prove that $\Gamma(t,s)$, given in (1.12), satisfies hypotheses a) and b) of Theorem 1.1. Given $\varphi,\psi \in Q$, it follows from (3.4) that

$$q_{H(t)}(\varphi,\psi) - q_{H(s)}(\varphi,\psi) = \left\langle\varphi,\left(\mathbf{F}(t)^2-\mathbf{F}(s)^2\right)\psi\right\rangle - 2\left\langle\varphi,(\mathbf{F}(t)-\mathbf{F}(s))\cdot\mathbf{D}\psi\right\rangle, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ is the closure of $(-i\nabla-\mathbf{A})$ as an operator from $\mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathrm{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{C}^d)$. Thus, letting $\varphi = H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\varphi}, \psi = H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\psi}$ with $\widetilde{\varphi},\widetilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(t,s) &:= H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(H(t)-H(s))H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{F}(t)^2-\mathbf{F}(s)^2)H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 2H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\{\mathbf{F}(t)-\mathbf{F}(s)\right\}\cdot\mathbf{D}H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\mathbf{F}(t) \in C^1(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\left\|\mathbf{D}H^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \le C_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ a constant [BGKS, Proposition 2.3 (*i*)], we have that $C(t,s)$, $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)$, $\frac{1}{t-s}C(t,s)$, and $\frac{1}{t-s}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)$ are all uniformly bounded in norm for t,s ($t \ne s$) in $\mathcal{I}$. Let

$$\widetilde{N}_{\mathcal{I}} := \sup_{t,s\in\mathcal{I},t\ne s}\left\|(t-s)^{-1}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)\right\| < \infty\ . \tag{3.10}$$

In addition we have that $s \mapsto H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is continuous in norm. Indeed, by the so-called Dunford-Taylor formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - H(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}) &= \tfrac{1}{\pi}\textstyle\int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left((H(s)+\lambda)^{-1} - (H(t)+\lambda)^{-1}\right)d\lambda \\ &= \tfrac{1}{\pi}\textstyle\int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(H(t)+\lambda)^{-1}\,H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)\,H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(H(s)+\lambda)^{-1}\,d\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Since $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)\to 0$ in norm (as $t\to s$) by (3.10), and $H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}$ and $\left(H(s)+\lambda\right)^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded for $t,s\in\mathcal{I}$ with

$$H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}<\frac{C_0}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\,,\quad\text{and}\quad \left(H(s)+\lambda\right)^{-1}<\frac{1}{1+\lambda}\,, \tag{3.12}$$

where C_0 being a constant, the claim now follows.

Now, (3.9), together with norm continuity of $H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathbf{F}(t)\in C^1(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R}^d)$, also shows that $C(t,s)$, $H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)$, $\frac{1}{t-s}C(t,s)$, and $\frac{1}{t-s}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)$ are all jointly continuous in norm for t,s $(t\neq s)$ in $\mathcal{I}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} C(s)&:=\lim_{t\uparrow s}\tfrac{1}{(t-s)}C(t,s) && (3.13)\\ &=2H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{F}'(s)\cdot\mathbf{F}(s)H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}-2H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{F}'(s)\cdot\mathbf{D}H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

exists boundedly (in norm).

With (3.10) and (3.12), we now have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(s)+\lambda\right)^{-1}\varphi\,d\lambda\right\|\\ &\qquad\le\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tfrac{C_0}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\right)^2\widetilde{N}_{\mathcal{I}}|t-s|\|\varphi\|\,d\lambda\;=\;C_{\mathcal{I}}|t-s|\|\varphi\|, \end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

where $C_{\mathcal{I}}=\frac{C_0^2}{4\pi}\widetilde{N}_{\mathcal{I}}\int_0^\infty\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}<\infty$. Therefore, from (1.12), (3.11), and (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(t,s)\varphi&=H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}(H(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}-H(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}})\varphi && (3.15)\\ &=\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)\,H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(s)+\lambda\right)^{-1}\varphi\,d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and this shows that, for each $\varphi\in\mathcal{H}$,

$$\|\tfrac{1}{t-s}\Gamma(t,s)\varphi\|\le C_{\mathcal{I}}\|\varphi\|\quad\text{for all }\ t,s\in\mathcal{I},\ (t\neq s). \tag{3.16}$$

To show strong continuity of $\frac{1}{t-s}\Gamma(t,s)$, let us set $T_\lambda(t):=H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}$. By (3.12), $T_\lambda(t)$ is uniformly bounded in t for all $\lambda>0$. To see that $T_\lambda(t)$ is strongly continuous on $\mathcal{H}$, let $\varphi\in\mathcal{H}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(T_\lambda(t)-T_\lambda(t')\right)\varphi=\left\{H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}-H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t')+\lambda\right)^{-1}\right\}\varphi\\ &\quad=\left\{\left(H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}-H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)H(t')^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\}H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}\varphi && (3.17)\\ &\qquad\quad+\ \left\{H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t')+\lambda\right)^{-1}H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}C(t',t)\,H(t')^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(H(t)+\lambda\right)^{-1}\varphi && (3.18)\\ &\quad\to 0\ \text{ as } t\to t'\,, && (3.19) \end{aligned}$$

where (3.17) goes to 0 by (2.6) (applied twice) and (3.12), and (3.18) goes to 0 by (3.9), (3.12), and the fact that $F(t)\in C^1(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Thus, from (3.15),

$$\tfrac{1}{t-s}\Gamma(t,s)\varphi=\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}T_\lambda(t)\left\{\tfrac{1}{t-s}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)\right\}T_\lambda(s)\varphi\,d\lambda, \tag{3.20}$$

and since $\frac{1}{t-s}H(s)^{\frac{1}{2}}C(t,s)$ is jointly strongly continuous for $t,s\,(t\neq s)$ in $\mathcal{I}$, (3.19) concludes that $\frac{1}{t-s}\Gamma(t,s)\varphi$ is also jointly strongly continuous for $t,s\,(t\neq s)$ in $\mathcal{I}$. This shows hypothesis *a*) of Theorem 1.1.

It now follows from (3.13), (3.16), (3.19), and (3.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1(u) &:= \lim_{t\uparrow u} \tfrac{-1}{t-u}\Gamma(t,u)\varphi \qquad (3.21)\\ &= -\tfrac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} H(u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(H(u)+\lambda\right)^{-1} H(u)^{\frac{1}{2}} C(u)\, H(u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(H(u)+\lambda\right)^{-1} \varphi\, d\lambda,\end{aligned}$$

the limit being uniform in $u \in \mathcal{I}$. Similarly, it follows from (3.9), as in (3.13), that

$$\widehat{C}(u) := \lim_{s\uparrow u} \tfrac{1}{u-s} C(u,s) \tag{3.22}$$

exists boundedly (in norm), and that $\widehat{C}(u) = C(u)$. Therefore, it follows, as before,

$$\Gamma_2(u) := \lim_{s\uparrow u} \tfrac{1}{u-s}\Gamma(u,s)\varphi = -\Gamma_1(u), \tag{3.23}$$

with the limit being uniform in $u \in \mathcal{I}$. This finishes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

4. Quadratic forms on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_2$

In this section we define quadratic forms on $\mathcal{K}_2$ in order to give a precise meaning to the Liouville equation (1.34). Let H_ω and $H_\omega(t)$ be as in Theorem 1.3. For $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω we let $U_\omega(t,s)$ be the corresponding unitary propagator given in Theorem 1.1. As discussed in Section 1, the spaces $\mathcal{K}_i, i = 1, 2$, are left and right $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-modules, with left and right multiplications defined as in (1.25). We state [BGKS, Prop. 4.7] without its proof.

Proposition 4.1. *For each $i = 1, 2, \infty$, let*

$$\mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega) = U_\omega(t,s) \odot_L A_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(s,t) \quad \textit{for} \quad A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_i\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Then $\mathcal{U}(t,s)$ is a linear operator on $\mathcal{K}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \infty$, with

$$\mathcal{U}(t,r)\mathcal{U}(r,s) = \mathcal{U}(t,s)\,, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathcal{U}(t,t) = I\,, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\{\mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega)\}^{\ddagger} = \mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega^{\ddagger})\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{U}(t,s)$ is unitary on $\mathcal{K}_2$ and an isometry in $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_\infty$; it extends to an isometry on $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_1$ with the same properties. In addition, $\mathcal{U}(t,s)$ is jointly strongly continuous in t and s on $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$.

4.1. The operators $\mathcal{H}_L$ and $\mathcal{H}_R$ and their domains.

Since $U_\omega(t,s)$ depends on the electric field $\mathbf{E}$, let

$$U_\omega(\mathbf{E}=0,t,s) = U_\omega^{(0)}(t-s) := \mathrm{e}^{-i(t-s)H_\omega}\,. \tag{4.5}$$

For $\mathbf{E} = 0$, we consider

$$\mathcal{U}^{(0)}(t)(A_\omega) := U_\omega^{(0)}(t) \odot_L A_\omega \odot_R U_\omega^{(0)}(-t) \quad \text{for} \quad A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\odot\,. \tag{4.6}$$

It turns out $U_\omega^{(0)}(t) \odot_L A_\omega$ is a strongly continuous semi-group on $\mathcal{K}_2$; there is a self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{H}_L$ on $\mathcal{K}_2$ such that

$$e^{-it\mathcal{H}_L} A_\omega = U_\omega^{(0)}(t) \odot_L A_\omega = e^{-itH_\omega} \odot_L A_\omega \tag{4.7}$$

with a domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L)$. Similarly, we define $\mathcal{H}_L(s)$ by

$$\mathrm{e}^{-it\mathcal{H}_L(s)} A_\omega = \mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega(s)} \odot_L A_\omega. \tag{4.8}$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}_L, \mathcal{H}_R, \mathcal{H}_L(s)$, and $\mathcal{H}_R(s) \geq 1$ since $H_\omega \geq 1$.

Let $\mathcal{G}(t)$ be the strongly continuous unitary group on $\mathcal{K}_2$ given by (cf. [BGKS, Lemma 4.13])

$$\mathcal{G}(t)(A_\omega) := G(t)\, A_\omega G(t)^*, \quad \text{where } G(t) = \mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{F}(t)\cdot x}; \tag{4.9}$$

if $A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$ with $[x_j, A_\omega] \in \mathcal{K}_2$ for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d$, then

$$\partial_t \mathcal{G}(t)(A_\omega) = i[\mathbf{E}(t)\cdot x, \mathcal{G}(t)(A_\omega)] = i\mathcal{G}(t)([\mathbf{E}(t)\cdot x, A_\omega]). \tag{4.10}$$

Since

$$\mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega(s)} = \mathcal{G}(s)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega}\right) = G(s)\,\mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega}G(s)^*, \tag{4.11}$$

it follows that

$$H_\omega(s) = G(s)H_\omega G(s)^*, \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(s)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-it\mathcal{H}_L}A_\omega\right) &= \mathcal{G}(s)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega}\odot_L A_\omega\right) = \mathcal{G}(s)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega}\right)\odot_L \mathcal{G}(s)\left(A_\omega\right)\\ &= \mathrm{e}^{-itH_\omega(s)}\odot_L \mathcal{G}(s)\left(A_\omega\right) = \mathrm{e}^{-it\mathcal{H}_L(s)}\mathcal{G}(s)\left(A_\omega\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

This shows

$$\mathrm{e}^{-it\mathcal{H}_L(s)}A_\omega = \mathcal{G}(s)\left(\mathrm{e}^{-it\mathcal{H}_L}\mathcal{G}(s)^*(A_\omega)\right), \tag{4.14}$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{H}_L(s) = \mathcal{G}(s)\,\mathcal{H}_L\,\mathcal{G}(s)^*. \tag{4.15}$$

Recall that $H_\omega(t)^{\frac12}A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$ if $A_\omega\mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{D}(H_\omega(t)^{\frac12})$ and $H_\omega(t)^{\frac12}A_\omega : \mathcal{H}_c \to \mathcal{H}$ is in $\mathcal{K}_2$. Let

$$\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)} := \left\{A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 | H_\omega^{\frac12}A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2\right\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} := \left\{A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 | H_\omega(t)^{\frac12}A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2\right\}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proposition 4.2. *$\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$ are operator cores for ${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12}$ and $\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12}$, respectively, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} = \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12}) = \mathcal{D}({\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{D}({\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12})$ and

$${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12}A_\omega = {H_\omega}^{\frac12}A_\omega \quad \text{for all } A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}. \tag{4.17}$$

Indeed, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and $A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$, then as $t \to 0$

$$\frac{i}{t}\left(e^{-it{H_\omega}^{\frac12}} - 1\right)A_\omega\varphi \to {H_\omega}^{\frac12}A_\omega\varphi \tag{4.18}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_c$. Thus, on account of (4.7)

$${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12}A_\omega = i\partial_t\, e^{-it{\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12}}A_\omega\Big|_{t=0} = \lim_{t\to0}\frac{i}{t}\left(e^{-it{H_\omega}^{\frac12}} - 1\right)A_\omega = {H_\omega}^{\frac12}A_\omega. \tag{4.19}$$

Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12})$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12}A_\omega = H_\omega(t)^{\frac12}A_\omega \quad \text{for all } A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}. \tag{4.20}$$

We now show that $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12})$; that $\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}({\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac12})$ can be shown similarly. Let $A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac12})$ and $B_{n,\omega} := f_n\left(H_\omega(t)^{\frac12}\right)\odot_L A_\omega$, where $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of smooth, measurable, and compactly supported functions that converges to δ, the delta function. Then, $B_{n,\omega} \in \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$ and $B_{n,\omega} \to A_\omega$ in $\mathcal{K}_2$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_{n,\omega} = f_n\left(H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \odot_L \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \to \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega. \tag{4.21}$$

To conclude that $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$ is a core for $\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, it suffices to show that (see [RS1, Theorem VIII.11])

$$e^{is\,\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.22}$$

Since

$$e^{is\,H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathcal{D}(H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{D}(H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}), \tag{4.23}$$

given $B_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$, we note that

$$e^{is\,\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} B_\omega \mathcal{H}_c = \left(e^{is\,H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \odot_L B_\omega\right) \mathcal{H}_c = e^{is\,H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} B_\omega \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{D}(H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}). \tag{4.24}$$

Moreover, we have

$$H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{is\,\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} B_\omega = H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{is\,H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} B_\omega = e^{is\,\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2. \tag{4.25}$$

The desired (4.22) follows from (4.24) and (4.25). Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$ is a core for ${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

If $A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$, $H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega$ is well-defined on $\mathcal{H}_c$ by Theorem 1.2. Moreover, in view of (1.23), (3.4)-(3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\langle H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \rangle\rangle \\ &\quad = \langle\langle {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \rangle\rangle - 2\mathrm{Re}\,\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathbf{F}(t)\cdot \mathbf{D}\, A_\omega \rangle\rangle + |\mathbf{F}(t)|^2 \langle\langle A_\omega, A_\omega \rangle\rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Since $A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$, we have $|\mathbf{F}(t)|^2 \langle\langle A_\omega, A_\omega\rangle\rangle = |\mathbf{F}(t)|^2 \, |||A_\omega|||_2^2 < \infty$,

$$\langle\langle {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \rangle\rangle = \left|\left|\left| {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \right|\right|\right|_2^2 < \infty, \tag{4.27}$$

and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathbf{F}(t)\cdot \mathbf{D}\, A_\omega \rangle\rangle \le |\mathbf{F}(t)| \, |||A_\omega|||_2 \left|\left|\left| {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \right|\right|\right|_2 < \infty. \tag{4.28}$$

This shows $H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$ and, hence, $\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} \subset \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$, and we have $\mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)} = \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$.

To prove the last claim of the proposition, by (4.17) and (4.20) we can use the arguments in (4.26)-(4.28) to show that, given a Cauchy sequence $A_\omega^{(n)}$ in $\mathcal{K}_2$ with $A_\omega^{(n)} \in \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)} = \mathcal{D}_{L,t}^{(0)}$ for all n, ${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^{(n)}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{K}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^{(n)}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{K}_2$. Since $\mathcal{D}_L^{(0)}$ is an operator core for both ${\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we conclude that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{D}({\mathcal{H}_L}^{\frac{1}{2}})$. □

In a similar fashion, we define $e^{-it\mathcal{H}_R} A_\omega := A_\omega \odot_R e^{itH_\omega}$ and $e^{-it\mathcal{H}_R(s)} A_\omega := A_\omega \odot_R e^{itH_\omega(s)}$, where $\mathcal{H}_R \ge 1$ and $\mathcal{H}_R(t) \ge 1$ are self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_R)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_R(t))$, respectively, and let

$$\mathcal{D}_R^{(0)} := \left\{ A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 | H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^\ddagger \in \mathcal{K}_2 \right\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{R,t}^{(0)} := \left\{ A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 | H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^\ddagger \in \mathcal{K}_2 \right\}. \tag{4.29}$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{J} : A \mapsto A^{\ddagger}$ is an anti-unitary map on $\mathcal{K}_2$, and that (1.25) can be rewritten as $A_\omega \odot_R B_\omega = \mathcal{J}\left(B_\omega^* \odot_L \mathcal{J} A_\omega\right)$, we immediately have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *We have $\mathcal{J}\,\mathcal{H}_L\,\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{H}_R$, that is, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_R{}^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \left\{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L{}^{\frac{1}{2}})\right\}^{\ddagger}$ and*

$$\mathcal{H}_R{}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega = \left(\mathcal{H}_L{}^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^{\ddagger}\right)^{\ddagger} \quad \text{for all } A_\omega \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_R{}^{\frac{1}{2}}). \tag{4.30}$$

Similarly, $\mathcal{J}\,\mathcal{H}_L(t)\,\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{H}_R(t)$ for all t. In particular, the appropriate modification of Proposition 4.2 holds for $\mathcal{H}_R{}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_R(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

4.2. **The quadratic forms $\mathbb{H}_{L,t}$, $\mathbb{H}_{R,t}$, and $\mathbb{L}_t$.** Setting $Q(\mathcal{H}_L(t)) := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $Q(\mathcal{H}_R(t)) := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_R(t)^{\frac{1}{2}})$, we define the following quadratic forms:

$$\mathbb{H}_{L,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \rangle\rangle \quad \text{on} \quad Q(\mathcal{H}_L(t))\,, \tag{4.31}$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{R,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_R(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_R(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \rangle\rangle \quad \text{on} \quad Q(\mathcal{H}_R(t))\,, \tag{4.32}$$

where the inner product $\langle\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle\rangle$ on $\mathcal{K}_2$ is as in (1.23). By Proposition 4.2,

$$Q(|\mathbb{L}|) := Q(|\mathbb{L}_t|) = Q(\mathcal{H}_L(t)) \cap Q(\mathcal{H}_R(t))\,, \tag{4.33}$$

and set

$$|\mathbb{L}_t|(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \mathbb{H}_{L,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) + \mathbb{H}_{R,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) \quad \text{on} \quad Q(|\mathbb{L}|)\,. \tag{4.34}$$

We remark that (4.31), (4.32), and (4.34) are all closed forms, and on $Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$,

$$\mathbb{H}_{R,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) = \mathbb{H}_{L,t}\left(B_\omega^{\ddagger}, A_\omega^{\ddagger}\right) \tag{4.35}$$

by Proposition 4.3 and the fact that the map $\mathcal{J}\colon A_\omega \mapsto A_\omega^{\ddagger}$ is anti-unitary on $\mathcal{K}_2$.

There is a continuous bilinear map $\diamond : \mathcal{K}_2 \times \mathcal{K}_2 \to \mathcal{K}_1$, defined by

$$\diamond(A_\omega, B_\omega) := A_\omega \diamond B_\omega = A_\omega B_\omega \quad \text{for} \quad A, B \in \mathcal{K}_2 \cap \mathcal{K}_\infty\,. \tag{4.36}$$

Given $A, B \in \mathcal{K}_2$ and $C \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, it is shown in [BGKS, Lemma 3.21] that we have

$$\mathcal{T}(A_\omega \diamond B_\omega) = \left\langle\left\langle A_\omega^{\ddagger}, B_\omega \right\rangle\right\rangle\,, \tag{4.37}$$

$$\mathcal{T}(A_\omega \diamond B_\omega) = \mathcal{T}(B_\omega \diamond A_\omega)\,, \tag{4.38}$$

$$\mathcal{T}((C_\omega \odot_L A_\omega) \diamond B_\omega) = \mathcal{T}(A_\omega \diamond (B_\omega \odot_R C_\omega))\,. \tag{4.39}$$

($\mathcal{T}$, the trace per unit volume, is defined in (1.24).) We also recall [BGKS, Lemma 3.24] that, if $B_{n,\omega}$ is a bounded sequence in $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that $B_{n,\omega} \to B_\omega$ weakly, then for all $A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_1$ we have

$$\mathcal{T}(B_{n,\omega} \odot_L A_\omega) \to \mathcal{T}(B_\omega \odot_L A_\omega) \ \text{ and } \ \mathcal{T}(A_\omega \odot_R B_{n,\omega}) \to \mathcal{T}(A_\omega \odot_R B_\omega). \tag{4.40}$$

Let us set

$$Q^{(0)} := \mathcal{D}_L^{(0)} \cap \mathcal{D}_R^{(0)} = \left\{A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2 \mid H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^{\ddagger} \in \mathcal{K}_2\right\}. \tag{4.41}$$

where independence of $Q^{(0)}$ in t is justified by Proposition 4.2. We also define $\mathbb{L}_t$ on $Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$ by

$$\mathbb{L}_t(A_\omega, B_\omega) := \mathbb{H}_{L,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) - \mathbb{H}_{R,t}(A_\omega, B_\omega) \tag{4.42}$$

where definitions (4.31)-(4.33) are used here. Recalling (4.1), we now show that, given $B_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$, $\mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)$ is differentiable in both t and r. We state this result in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $A_\omega \in Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$ and $B_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$. The map $t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega) \in \mathcal{K}_2$ is differentiable in $\mathcal{K}_2$ in t he following sense:*

$$i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle = \mathbb{L}_t(A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)). \tag{4.43}$$

Similarly,

$$i\partial_r \langle\langle B_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(A_\omega)\rangle\rangle = -\mathbb{L}_r(\mathcal{U}(r,t)(B_\omega), A_\omega)\,. \tag{4.44}$$

Proof. We first focus on (4.43). Let us note that

$$i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle = i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, U_\omega(t,r) \odot_L B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t)\rangle\rangle \tag{4.45}$$

$$= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{i}{h} \langle\langle A_\omega, (U_\omega(t+h,r) - U_\omega(t,r)) \odot_L B_w \odot_R U_\omega(r,t)\,\rangle\rangle \tag{4.46}$$

$$+ \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{i}{h} \langle\langle A_\omega, U_\omega(t,r) \odot_L B_w \odot_R (U_\omega(r,t+h) - U_\omega(r,t))\,\rangle\rangle\,. \tag{4.47}$$

Using (4.37)-(4.39), we can first rewrite (4.46) as follows:

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{i}{h}\, \langle\langle A_\omega, (U_\omega(t+h,r) - U_\omega(t,r)\} \odot_L B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t)\,\rangle\rangle \tag{4.48}$$

$$= \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{i}{h} \langle\langle\, \mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \{U_\omega(t+h,r) - U_\omega(t,r)\}\, H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L$$

$$\odot_L H_\omega(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t)\,\rangle\rangle \tag{4.49}$$

$$= \lim_{h\to 0} \tfrac{i}{h}\, \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \{U_\omega(t+h,r) - U_\omega(t,r)\}\, H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L\right.$$

$$\left.\odot_L H_\omega(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t) \diamond (\mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega)^{\ddagger}\right)\,. \tag{4.50}$$

We take the limit in (4.50) inside the trace per unit volume, using (4.40). Remember that $\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = H_\omega(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L$, and note the following reformulation of (1.18) in Theorem 1.1:

$$i\partial_t H(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} U(t,s) H(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^* H(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} U(t,s) H(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.51}$$

(4.50) is now equal to:

$$= \mathcal{T}\left((H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^* H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_\omega(t,r) H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L\right.$$

$$\left.\odot_L H_\omega(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t) \diamond (\mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega)^{\ddagger}\right) \tag{4.52}$$

$$= \mathcal{T}\left(\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega) \diamond (\mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega)^{\ddagger} \odot_R (H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^*\right) \tag{4.53}$$

$$= \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega) \diamond (\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega)^{\ddagger}\right) \tag{4.54}$$

$$= \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle\ , \tag{4.55}$$

where the equality in (4.53) is due to (4.39), and to go from (4.53) to (4.54), we used the fact that

$$H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L C_\omega = \mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} C_\omega \in Q^{(0)} \quad \text{with} \quad C_\omega := \mathcal{H}_L(t_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2. \tag{4.56}$$

Indeed, this shows (4.54) since

$$C_\omega^{\ddagger} \odot_R (H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^* = (H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} H_\omega(t_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L C_\omega)^{\ddagger} = {C_\omega}^{\ddagger} \tag{4.57}$$

by (1.25), (4.20), and (4.56).

Repeating the above arguments, one can also show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{i}{h}\langle\langle A_\omega, U_\omega \odot_L B_\omega \odot_R \left(U_\omega(r,t+h)-U_\omega(r,t)\right)\rangle\rangle \\ &\qquad = -\langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{U}_\omega(B_\omega^\ddagger),\, \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega^\ddagger\rangle\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.58}$$

With (4.55) and (4.58), we get (4.43).

The equality (4.44) now follows from (4.43). Indeed, for all $A_\omega, B_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle A_\omega,\, U_\omega(t,r)\odot_L B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t)\rangle\rangle \\ &= \big\langle\big\langle (B_\omega \odot_R U_\omega(r,t))^\ddagger,\, (U_\omega(r,t)\odot_L A_\omega)^\ddagger\big\rangle\big\rangle \\ &= \big\langle\big\langle B_\omega^\ddagger,\, \{\mathcal{U}_\omega(r,t)(A_\omega)\}^\ddagger\big\rangle\big\rangle = \langle\langle \mathcal{U}_\omega(r,t)(A_\omega),\, B_\omega\rangle\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

Hence, (4.43) gives us

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial r\langle\langle B_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(A_\omega)\rangle\rangle &= i\partial r\langle\langle \mathcal{U}(r,t)(B_\omega),\, A_\omega\rangle\rangle = \overline{-i\partial r\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(r,t)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle} \\ &= \overline{-\mathbb{L}_r(A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(r,t)(B_\omega))} = -\mathbb{L}_r(\mathcal{U}(r,t)(B_\omega), A_\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

□

5. The generalized Liouville equation

Let H_ω be the ergodic magnetic Schrödinger operator in (1.3)-(1.4). With the adiabatic switching of a spatially homogeneous electric field $\mathbf{E}$, the system is described by the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_\omega(t)$ as in (1.7). By Theorem 1.2, the quadratic form domain $Q(H_\omega(t))$ is independent of t.

We fix an initial equilibrium state at $t = -\infty$, for which we use the density matrix ζ_ω. For physical applications, we take $\zeta_\omega = f(H_\omega)$ with f the Fermi-Dirac distribution at inverse temperature $\beta \in (0,\infty]$ and Fermi energy $E_F \in \mathbb{R}$, that is,

$$\zeta_\omega \;=\; \begin{cases} F_\omega^{(\beta,E_F)} \;:=\; \frac{1}{1+\mathrm{e}^{\beta(H_\omega - E_F)}}\,, & \beta<\infty\,, \\ P_\omega^{(E_F)} \;:=\; \chi_{(-\infty,E_F]}(H_\omega)\,, & \beta=\infty\,. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

The key hypotheses are that ζ_ω is real-valued, $\zeta_\omega \geq 0$, and for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, d$,

$$[x_k, \zeta_\omega] \in \mathcal{K}_2. \tag{5.2}$$

which is implied by assumption (1.10). Note that it follows from (5.1) that $H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty \cap \mathcal{K}_2$ (to see $H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$ use also [BGKS, Proposition 2.1]). In particular, we have $\zeta_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$.

Recalling (4.9), we set

$$\zeta_\omega(t) = \mathcal{G}(t)(\zeta_\omega) = G(t)\,\zeta_\omega\,G(t)^*, \tag{5.3}$$

and note that $\zeta_\omega(t) \in Q^{(0)}$ in view of Propositions 4.2 and 4.3.

The density matrix $\varrho_\omega(t)$ evolves formally by the Liouville equation (1.9). Remembering $\mathbb{L}_t$ on $Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$ from (4.33) and (4.42), we now state the following theorem, which generalizes Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 5.1. *There exists a unique $Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$-valued function $\varrho_\omega(t)$, which solves the Liouville equation* (1.9) *weakly in $Q^{(0)}$ in the following sense:*

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t\langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle = \mathbb{L}_t(A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)) \\ \lim_{t\to-\infty}\langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, \zeta_\omega\rangle\rangle \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

for all $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$.

Moreover, the unique solution $\varrho_\omega(t) \in Q^{(0)}$ *for all* t *and is given by*

$$\varrho_\omega(t) = \lim_{s\to-\infty} \mathcal{U}(t,s)\,(\zeta_\omega) = \lim_{s\to-\infty} \mathcal{U}(t,s)\,(\zeta_\omega(s)) \tag{5.5}$$

$$= \zeta_\omega(t) - i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r\, \mathrm{e}^{\eta r_-}\, \mathcal{U}(t,r)\left([\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]\right). \tag{5.6}$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $A_\omega \in Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$. *Then,*

$$\mathbb{L}_t(A_\omega, \zeta_\omega(t)) = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $A_\omega = A_\omega^\ddagger$ and consider

$$\widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t) := f_n(\mathcal{H}_L(t))\zeta_\omega(t) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_L(t)), \tag{5.8}$$

where f_n be a sequence of measurable, bounded, and compactly supported functions such that $f_n \to \delta$, the Dirac-delta function.

Since $\mathcal{H}_L(t)\widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t)$ is self-adjoint, a simple calculation yields

$$\mathbb{H}_{L,t}(A_\omega, \widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t)) = \mathbb{H}_{R,t}(A_\omega, \widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t)), \tag{5.9}$$

which shows (5.7) with $\widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t)$. However, by (4.38), (4.37), and (4.40)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle &= \mathcal{T}\left(\{\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega\}^\ddagger \diamond \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_n(\mathcal{H}_L(t))\zeta_\omega(t)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{T}\left(f_n(\mathcal{H}_L(t))\left[\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega(t) \diamond \{\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega\}^\ddagger\right]\right) \\ &\to \mathcal{T}\left(\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega(t) \diamond \{\mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega\}^\ddagger\right) = \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega, \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Similarly, one can also show

$$\langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\zeta}_\omega(t), \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega\rangle\rangle \to \langle\langle \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta_\omega(t), \mathcal{H}_L(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}A_\omega\rangle\rangle \tag{5.11}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Together with (5.10) we have (5.7) for all $\zeta_\omega(t)$. □

The following lemma plays a crucial role in proving Theorem 5.1.

Lemma 5.3. *We have* $[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega] \in Q^{(0)}$.

Proof. We need to prove $[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega]\,\mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{D}(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\,[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega] \in \mathcal{K}_2$. We will do this for $\zeta_\omega = P_\omega^{(E_F)}$, since the other case is slightly easier. It also suffices to show that $\left[x_j, P_\omega^{(E_F)}\right]$ is in $Q^{(0)}$ for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$.

To show $\left[x_j, P_\omega^{(E_F)}\right]\mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{D}(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}})$, we only need to verify $x_j P_\omega^{(E_F)}\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ (since $P_\omega^{(E_F)} x_j\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_c$). Let η_N be a sequence of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ functions such that $|\eta_N| \le 1$ for all N and $\eta_N = 1$ for $x_j \in [-N, N]$ and decays to 0 otherwise. Then,

$$x_j^{(N)} := x_j\eta_N(x_j) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \tag{5.12}$$

has the property that for all N, $\partial_{x_j}\left|x_j^{(N)}\right| < C$ for some fixed constant C. By assumption (1.10) (which implies $x_j P_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$), we have that as $N \to \infty$

$$x_j^{(N)} P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi \to x_j P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{H} \tag{5.13}$$

for all $\phi = \chi_0\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_c$.

Recall $H_+ = H(\mathbf{A}, V_+) = \mathbf{D}^*\mathbf{D} + V_+$ and note that $\mathbf{D}x_j^{(N)}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi$ is well-defined since $\left\|\mathbf{D}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\right\| = \left\|\mathbf{D}{H_\omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}}{H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\right\| < \infty$ and

$$\mathbf{D}x_j^{(N)}P_\omega\phi = x_j^{(N)}\mathbf{D}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi - i\delta_{kj}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(x_j^{(N)}\right)P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi\ , \tag{5.14}$$

where δ_{kj} is the vector consisting of 1 in the j-th entry (i.e., when $k = j$) and 0 elsewhere. Since $x_j^{(N)}$ is compactly supported, ${V_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_j^{(N)}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi$ is well-defined as well, and this shows $x_j^{(N)}P_\omega\phi \in \mathcal{D}({H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}})$.

In (5.15)-(5.18), we use $P_\omega = P_\omega^{(E_F)}$, $\left(x_j^{(N)}\right)' = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}x_j^{(N)}$, and $x_j^{(N,M)} = \left(x_j^{(N)} - x_j^{(M)}\right)$. Given $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|{H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi\right\|^2 && (5.15)\\
&\quad= \langle \mathbf{D}x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi, \mathbf{D}x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi\rangle + \langle x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi, V_+x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi\rangle && (5.16)\\
&\quad= \langle {H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}P_\omega\phi, {H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(x_j^{(N,M)}\right)^2P_\omega\phi\rangle - i\langle\left(x_j^{(N,M)}\right)'P_\omega\phi, \mathbf{D}_jx_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi\rangle && (5.17)\\
&\quad\leq \|H_+P_\omega\phi\|\left\|\left(x_j^{(N,M)}\right)^2P_\omega\phi\right\| + \widetilde{C}\,\|\mathbf{D}_jP_\omega\phi\|\left\|x_j^{(N,M)}P_\omega\phi\right\| \to 0 && (5.18)
\end{aligned}$$

as $N, M \to \infty$. Here, $\widetilde{C} = \sup_{N,M}\left|\left(x_j^{(N,M)}\right)'\right|$ and equality in (5.17) is justified by (5.14). Thus, ${H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_j^{(N)}P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{H}$, and its limit ${H_+}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi$ is in $\mathcal{H}$ for a.e. ω. It also follows that ${H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ for a.e. ω by Theorem 1.2.

We now turn to the claim ${H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[x_j, P_\omega^{(E_F)}\right]$ is in $\mathcal{K}_2$. For this, it suffices to verify

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|{H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2\right\} < \infty. \tag{5.19}$$

Let $\{\phi_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis for $\chi_0\mathcal{H}$. By the arguments that led to (5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|{H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2\right\} = \mathbb{E}\sum_n\left\langle H_\omega^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n, {H_\omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n\right\rangle && (5.20)\\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{E}\sum_n\left\{\left\|H_\omega P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n\right\|\left\|x_j^2P_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n\right\| + C\left\|\mathbf{D}_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n\right\|\left\|x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\phi_n\right\|\right\}\\
&\quad\leq C'\,\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|H_\omega P_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2 + \left\|x_j^2P_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2 + \left\|\mathbf{D}_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2 + \left\|x_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}\chi_0\right\|_2^2\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by (1.10) and the fact that $H_\omega P_\omega^{(E_F)}$ and $\mathbf{D}_jP_\omega^{(E_F)}$ are in $\mathcal{K}_2$ (see [BGKS, Lemma 5.4]). Here, C' is constant, and this completes the proof. □

With Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, we now prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By (4.10) and Proposition 4.4, we first note that, given $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & i\partial_s \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)(\zeta_\omega(s))\rangle\rangle \\ & \quad = -\mathbb{L}_s(\mathcal{U}(s,t)(A_\omega), \zeta_\omega(s)) - \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)([\mathbf{E}(s)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(s)])\rangle\rangle \qquad (5.21) \\ & \quad = -\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)([\mathbf{E}(s)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(s)])\rangle\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality (5.21) comes from Lemma 5.2. Hence,

$$\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)(\zeta_\omega(s))\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, \zeta_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle - i\int_s^t \mathrm{d}r\, \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\rangle\rangle \tag{5.22}$$

which shows (5.6). The second equality in (5.5) follows from the strong continuity of $\mathcal{G}(t)$. Since $\mathcal{U}(t,r)\,([\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(s)]) \in \mathcal{K}_2$ by (1.10) and Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle &= \lim_{s\to-\infty} \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)(\zeta_\omega(s))\rangle\rangle \\ &= \langle\langle A_\omega, \zeta_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle - i\int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{d}r\, \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\rangle\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

We now claim that

$$H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) \in \mathcal{K}_2. \tag{5.24}$$

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) \\ & \quad = \mathrm{e}^{\eta r_-} H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} U_\omega(t,r) H_\omega(r)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \odot_L H_\omega(r)^{\frac{1}{2}}[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)] \odot_R U_\omega(r,t) \qquad (5.25) \\ & \quad = \mathrm{e}^{\eta r_-} W_\omega(t,r) \odot_L \mathcal{G}(r)\left(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}}[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega]\right) \odot_R U_\omega(r,t). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{G}(r)$ as in (4.9) is a unitary map on $\mathcal{K}_2$, we have $\mathcal{G}(r)\left(H_\omega{}^{\frac{1}{2}}[\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega]\right) \in \mathcal{K}_2$ by Lemma 5.3. Since $W_\omega(t,s)$ is uniformly bounded, (5.24) follows from Proposition 4.1.

It also follows from (5.24) that

$$\int_s^t \mathrm{d}r\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) \in \mathcal{K}_2\,, \tag{5.26}$$

where we used the Bochner integral above. Moreover,

$$\int_s^t \mathrm{d}r\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) = H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}}\int_s^t \mathrm{d}r\, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\,, \tag{5.27}$$

by a similar argument following [BGKS, Eq. (5.29)].

We now continue from (5.23). Recalling Proposition 4.4, Lemma 5.2, (4.10), and (5.3), letting $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, \varrho_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle \qquad\qquad (5.28)\\
&= -\langle\langle A_\omega, [\mathbf{E}(t)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(t)]\rangle\rangle + \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,t)([\mathbf{E}(t)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(t)])\rangle\rangle\\
&\qquad - i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r\,\{\, i\partial_t\, \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\rangle\rangle\}\\
&= -i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r \langle\langle H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega,\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\rangle\rangle \qquad (5.29)\\
&\qquad + i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r \langle\langle H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]^{\ddagger}),\, H_\omega(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\omega^{\ddagger}\rangle\rangle \qquad (5.30)\\
&= \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t\left(A_\omega, -i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r\, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\right) \qquad (5.31)\\
&= \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t\left(A_\omega, \zeta_\omega(t) - i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r\, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)])\right) = \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t\left(A_\omega,\, \varrho_\omega(t)\right). \qquad (5.32)
\end{aligned}$$

where to go from (5.29)-(5.30) to (5.31) we used (5.26), (5.27), and the definition of $\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t$ in (1.30).

Since $-i\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathrm{d}r\, \mathcal{U}(t,r)([\mathbf{E}(r)\cdot\mathbf{x}, \zeta_\omega(r)]) \in Q^{(0)}$ by (5.26) and (5.27), we can replace $\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}_t$ in (5.31)-(5.32) with $\mathbb{L}_t$ by (4.17). This shows that $\varrho_\omega(t)$, given in (5.6), is a solution to the Liouville equation (5.4) (and (1.34)) for all $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$.

It remains to show the solution $\varrho_\omega(t)$ is unique in $\mathcal{K}_2$. Let $v_\omega(t)$ be a solution of (5.4) with $\zeta_\omega = 0$, then it suffices to show that $v_\omega(t) = 0$ for all t. By (4.59), which states that for $A_\omega, B_\omega \in \mathcal{K}_2$

$$\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,r)(B_\omega)\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \mathcal{U}(r,t)(A_\omega), B_\omega\rangle\rangle\ , \tag{5.33}$$

we have that for $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$ and $v_\omega(t) \in Q(|\mathbb{L}|)$,

$$i\partial_t \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(s,t)(v_\omega(t))\rangle\rangle = -\mathbb{L}_r(\mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega), v_\omega(t)) + \mathbb{L}_r(\mathcal{U}(t,s)(A_\omega), v_\omega(t)) = 0 \tag{5.34}$$

by Proposition 4.4. Hence, letting $t = s$, we conclude that for all $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$,

$$\langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(s,t)(v_\omega(t))\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(s,s)(v_\omega(s))\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, v_\omega(s)\rangle\rangle\ . \tag{5.35}$$

This shows $\langle\langle A_\omega, v_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle A_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t,s)(v_\omega(s))\rangle\rangle$, and letting $s \to -\infty$ we see that $\langle\langle A_\omega, v_\omega(t)\rangle\rangle = 0$ for all t and for all $A_\omega \in Q^{(0)}$. Since $Q^{(0)}$ is dense in $\mathcal{K}_2$, $v_\omega(t) = 0$, and this completes the proof. □

References

[BGKS] Bouclet, J.M., Germinet, F., Klein, A., Schenker, J.H. *Linear response theory for magnetic Schrödinger operators in disordered media*, J. Funct. Anal. 226, 301-372 (2005).

[CFKS] Cycon, H.L., Froese, R.G., Kirsch, W., Simon, B.: *Schrödinger operators*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[F] Faris, W.G.: *Self-Adjoint Operators*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **433**. Springer-Verlag, 1975.

[GK1] Germinet, F., Klein, A.: Operator kernel estimates for functions of generalized Schrödinger operators. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131, 911-920 (2003).

[GK2] Germinet, F., Klein, A.: New characterizations of the region of complete localization for random Schrödinger operators. J. Stat. Phys. **122**, 73-94 (2006)

[K] Kisyński, J.: Sur les opérateurs de Green des problèms de Cauchy abstraits. Studia Mathematica, T. **XXIII**, 285-328 (1964).

[LS] H. Leinfelder, C.G. Simader, *Schrödinger operators with singular magnetic potentials*, Math. Z. 176, 1-19 (1981).

[RS1] Reed, M., Simon, B.: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*, revised and enlarged edition. Academic Press, 1980.

[RS2] Reed, M., Simon, B.: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*. Academic Press, 1975.

[S1] Simon, B.: *Quantum mechanics for Hamiltonians defined as quadratic forms*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1971.

[S2] Simon, B.: Maximal and minimal Schrödinger forms. J. Operator Theory **1**, 37-47 (1979).

[Y] Yosida, K.: *Functional Analysis, 6th edition.* Springer-Verlag, 1980.

(Kang) Michigan State University, Department of Mathematics, East Lansing, MI 48823, USA

E-mail address: `ykang@math.msu.edu`

(Klein) University of California, Irvine, Department of Mathematics, Irvine, CA 92697-3875, USA

E-mail address: `aklein@math.uci.edu`